



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

discussion. We each surrendered about equal quantities of first impressions and without any compromise or sacrifice, and now are both quite content with our text." Yet absolute agreement could not be expected, and traces of editorial independence are to be seen in the appendix of the published work.

The critical positions of the revision were probably due to Hort rather than Westcott, and he is to be credited with the second volume of their New Testament, in which the principles are elaborately stated, defended and applied. The development of these principles are said by the editor of Hort's life to be traceable in various reviews, notably in that of Tregelles, first part, in July 1857. The same year the plans of the revision were submitted to Tischendorf who gave them his approval. The value of a manuscript's tendencies and affinities as a help towards discovering the internal evidence of documents was well formulated by May 1860, as appears in a letter to Lightfoot. So important did Hort then already begin to see were his principles that he confessed to an unwillingness to submit to the criticism of "amateurs." The immense labor which these principles necessitated appears in an unexpected fashion in a letter to Macmillan. Protesting against the charge of inaction brought against him by Jowett, he declares "those fellows don't know what work means, and they fancy that the weightiest questions of criticism can be dashed off without work." Again, a little later (May 9, 1862), in a letter to Westcott *à propos* of revision: "The work has to be done, and never can be done satisfactorily without vast labor—a fact of which hardly anybody in Europe except ourselves seems conscious."

There is at this day no need of any discussion of the critical principles which governed the work of these years. There is no text of the New Testament more authoritative than that of Westcott and Hort. Indeed, these volumes give us small information beyond that already set forth in the Introduction. One is tempted to regret sometimes that this is the case. Any thoughtful reader of the Introduction is often perplexed by both the brevity and the fulness of its treatment of various subjects. Yet perhaps it is as well that these two volumes of biography should not have been too technical. For, as it is, one reads them less from the desire to know merely Hort's critical principles, and is all the more ready to share in his broad thinking and to be inspired and warned by his prodigious industry.

S. M.

Aussercanonische Paralleltexte zu den Evangelien. Viertes Heft. **Paralleltexte zu Johannes**, gesammelt und untersucht von ALFRED RESCH. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung. 8vo. 1896, pp. iv + 224. M. 7.

The chief interest of this comparatively small volume lies in the introduction, and the retrospect which includes also the three preceding parts of the work. The introduction deals first and at great length with the oldest

external evidence for the gospel. The latest authorities named are Clement of Alexandria and Irenæus, who flourished about the close of the second century. The inquiry, therefore, is practically limited to that century and the closing decades of the first. The amount of evidence is nevertheless considerable, comprising not fewer than thirty items. Some of course are not new. Others are far from certain, especially the quotation purporting to be taken from a writing by Euodius, the predecessor of Ignatius in the see of Antioch, which is found in the ecclesiastical history of Nicephorus Callistus. It may be granted that the passage is curious and worth noting, but surely stronger evidence is required than the unsupported testimony of a third-rate author of the fourteenth century. Professor Harnack may indeed go too far in the opposite direction when he denies the possibility of genuineness, but the origin of the fragment is too doubtful for it to be safely used as a link in a chain of reasoning. By far the most striking testimony to the early existence and influence of the gospel is that supplied by the eucharistic prayers in the *Didache*, which are unquestionably older than the work itself in its present form. The reference to "the holy vine of David" (ix), the juxtaposition of two Johannine *hapax legomena* (compare *Didache* ix, 4, and John 11:52), the expression "holy father" (x), and the declaration that God has given spiritual food and drink and life eternal through his Son (x) seem unmistakably to imply intimate acquaintance with the gospel. Now if Dr. Resch is right in dating these prayers as early as 80 or 90 A. D. we are led to the surprising conclusion that the gospel must have been in ecclesiastical and liturgical use in some part of the church at any rate ten or twenty years before the close of the first century, that is, many years before the death of the apostle to whom tradition ascribes it, and then we must infer that it was written some years earlier still. Other very ancient evidence is found in the epistle of Clement of Rome which the late Bishop Lightfoot dismissed as written before the gospel, the newly discovered Apology of Aristides, which seems to contain a clear reminiscence of the clause, "and the word became flesh," *The Rest of the Words of Baruch*, assigned by its editor to the year 136 A. D., the Docetic gospel of Peter, and the two gnostic writings in Coptic contained in the Codex Bruce. One of these last mentioned works, which is assigned by Schmidt to the year 160 A. D., cites the prologue of the gospel as John's. If the date is correct, this is the earliest known mention of the evangelist's name; and is very significant, as it shows that the gospel was accepted as Johannine, even in heretical circles, in little more than half a century after the writer's death. An obscure statement in the so-called Muratorian canon furnishes material for a brilliant conjecture. Instead of "ex decipolis" it is proposed to read "ex decapoli," in which case Pella will be alluded to where we know that the Christians of Jerusalem were assembled in the year 70. This is at least an attractive emendation. The cumulative effect of the whole series of testimonies is very great indeed. The gospel seems to have been known and regarded as apostolic by Chris-

tians of all shades of opinion in all parts of the Roman world in the second century, and a strong case has been made out for its official use in the last twenty years of the first. Dr. Resch himself has not the least doubt of its apostolic authority and Johannine origin, which, he says, ought never to have been questioned. In the last paragraph of his book he refers to these certainties as the corner stone of the whole fabric of gospel research. The fourth gospel is the solid shore from which it is possible to survey the surging waters of synoptic criticism with unruffled composure, or even to venture without fear among their rocks or into their shallows.

The other part of the introduction is devoted to a very able inquiry into the composition of the gospel of John. Its distinctive features as compared with those of the synoptic gospels (or rather, with those of the Semitic gospel which underlies them) are due chiefly, he thinks, to four causes: (1) diversity of character and capacity; (2) difference of time; (3) difference of conception; (4) difference of language. It consists of eighteen larger and smaller fragments put together for the purpose declared in 20:31, but also with the subordinate intention of supplementing the original Matthew or Ur-Evangelium. One of the most striking characteristics is the remarkable combination of historical exactness and ideal freedom. The apostle at the same time represented his fellow disciples, and wrote under the guidance of the prophetic Spirit. He was a Christian historian and a Christian prophet. This tallies exactly with the evidence of early tradition, as preserved by the Muratorian canon, Theophilus, and Clement of Alexandria.

The extra-canonical parallels to this gospel fall far below those to the synoptists both in number and significance. The verbal variants, which are more than two thousand, in the latter scarcely reach a hundred, and their character is wholly different. The gospel of John, therefore, is thought to furnish a negative proof of the existence of a precanonical document underlying the synoptic gospels and their extra-canonical parallels.

Under these circumstances the "texts and researches" of this volume could not but be fewer and less interesting than those of the two preceding volumes. They contain however, notwithstanding, much curious and valuable material. The notes on 1:13; 3:5; 4:24, and the mysterious *Σαμφορεῖν* of D in 11:54 are exceedingly suggestive.

The value of the Lewis codex has been much overrated in the judgment of Dr. Resch. He holds it to be later than the Curetonian, which with Baethgen he assigns to the middle of the third century. Its significance for textual criticism is but moderate. This unfavorable estimate may account for some omissions. The word "father," for instance, is found in the Lewis codex of John 6:38 as well as in the Curetonian, but the latter only is mentioned. The "narrow-hearted" reading, "it is the spirit that quickeneth the flesh" (6:63), which is said to have been "manufactured" by the Curetonian is common to it and the new authority.

The remarkable variant of the Lewis codex in 14:22—"Thomas" for

"Judas"—which Dr. Resch has not found noticed in any previous discussion of this manuscript, was mentioned by Rev. W. E. Barnes in the *Thinker* of January 1895.

It is incidentally remarked (note on p. 140) that the author has compiled a collection of Old Testament Agrapha which he does not know whether he will ever publish. It is to be hoped that the time and means will be forthcoming, as such a work might shed new light on dark places in early Christian literature.

W. TAYLOR SMITH.

Jesu Muttersprache. Das Galiläische Aramäisch in seiner Bedeutung für die Erklärung der Reden Jesu. Von LIC. ARNOLD MEYER. Freiburg, 1896. Pp. xiv + 176. M. 3.

The positions ably maintained and defended in the work before us are these: that a dialect of Aramaic, closely resembling those found in the Palestinian Lectionary and Talmud, was the common speech of Galilee in the times of Christ. That Jesus, the carpenter's son, since "the common people heard him gladly," spoke in the same language. That the disciples were "sons of the soil," and if they transcribed the sayings of Christ would transcribe them as they were delivered; certainly not in Hebrew, because of their very limited acquaintance with that tongue. There is thus an *a priori* probability, apart altogether from patristic evidence, for the early existence of an Aramaic gospel for the use of the churches who constantly spoke in that language. Delitzsch and Resch defend Hebrew as the language in which the Protevangelium was written, and even Dalman is doubtful, but surely the matter is capable of easy solution. Let the two cognate languages be tested on the divergences of our Greek synoptics, and the decision given to that language which elucidates them. The present writer began his investigations full of faith in Hebrew, but now, unhesitatingly, gives his verdict for Aramaic.

We heartily welcome as a fellow-laborer the author of *Jesu Muttersprache*, who publishes this work as a forerunner to a larger work on the Preaching of Jesus, and who is a consistent advocate of Galilean Aramaic, as the language in which Christ's sayings were first recorded. The work is important, however, more as a summary of what has previously been attempted in this field, than for its original contributions. The author has read extensively, and has collected carefully the views of many scholars since the Reformation, who have surmised that Christ did not speak Greek; and he also here displays and greatly criticises the attempts which several scholars have previously made to retranslate isolated sayings of Christ in Aramaic or Hebrew. Besides this, he gives us an interesting chapter on the prevalence of Aramaic in Palestine, and on the occurrence of Aramaic words in the New Testament and in Josephus; and an appendix describing the Christian Palestinian Lectionary. But when we seek for first-hand work elucidating the sayings